

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-87 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 15, 29, 42, 56, 75, 76, 84, and 86 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 2, 8, 10, 11, 14, 15, 29, 39, 42, 51, 56, 58-60, 63, 65-68, 75, 76, 81, 84, and 86 are sought to be amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Paragraph 3 of the Office Action rejects claims 1-87 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicant respectfully submits pending claims 1-87 overcome the rejection thereto set forth in paragraph 3 of the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, set forth in paragraph 3 of the Office Action. Support for the features recited in claims 1-87 can be found throughout the specification of the subject patent application including, by way of example and without limitation, the passage from page 25, line 19 to page 29, line 2, and at figures 6, 7, and 32. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, set forth in paragraph 3 of the Office Action.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Paragraph 5 of the Office Action rejects claims 1, 15, 29, 42, 56, 75, 76, and 86 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,738,796 to Mobini ("Mobini"). For at least the following reasons, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Claim 1 recites, in part, "an instruction disposed within a program thread, the instruction configured to de-schedule the program thread, to deallocate the program thread, and to reschedule the program thread to resume execution[.]" Claim 15 recites, in part, "the instruction is disposed within the one of the plurality of threads and is configured to de-schedule the one of the plurality of threads, to deallocate the one of the plurality of threads, and to reschedule the one of the plurality of threads to resume execution[.]" Claim 29 recites, in part, "wherein the instruction is configured to de-schedule the first thread, to deallocate the first thread, and to reschedule the first thread to resume execution." Claim 42 recites, in part, "an instruction disposed within the thread and configured to de-schedule the thread, to deallocate the thread, and to reschedule the thread to resume execution[.]" Claim 56 recites, in part, "the instruction is disposed within the thread and is configured to de-schedule the thread, to deallocate the thread, and to reschedule the thread to resume execution." Claim 75 recites, in part, "an instruction disposed within the thread, configured to de-schedule the thread, to deallocate the thread, and to reschedule the thread to resume execution[.]" Each of claims 76 and 86 recites, in part, "wherein the instruction is included in a program thread of a plurality of program threads and is configured to de-schedule the program thread, to deallocate the program thread, and to reschedule the program thread to resume execution[.]"

Applicant respectfully submits Mobini does not disclose at least these features of claims 1, 15, 29, 42, 56, 75, 76, and 86. Consequently, Applicant respectfully asserts independent claims 1, 15, 29, 42, 56, 75, 76, and 86 are not anticipated by Mobini. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 15, 29, 42, 56, 75, 76, and 86 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unanticipated by Mobini set forth at paragraph 5 of the Office Action.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Paragraph 8 of the Office Action rejects claims 2-14, 16-28, 30-41, 43-55, 57-74, 77-85, and 87 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mobini and U.S. Patent No. 5,949,994 to Dupree *et al.* ("Dupree"). For at least the following reasons, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Claims 2-14, 16-28, 30-41, 43-55, 57-74, 77-83, and 87

As explained above, Applicant respectfully submits claims 1, 15, 29, 42, 56, 75, 76, and 86 are patentable over Mobini. Applicant respectfully submits that Dupree does not overcome the deficiencies of Mobini. Claims 2-14, 16-28, 30-41, 43-55, 57-74, 77-83, and 87 depend from claims 1, 15, 29, 42, 56, 75, 76, or 86 and are therefore also patentable over Mobini and Dupree. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 2-14, 16-28, 30-41, 43-55, 57-74, 77-83, and 87 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mobini and Dupree set forth at paragraph 8 of the Office Action.

Claims 84 and 85

Claim 84 recites, in part, "wherein the instruction is included in a program thread of a plurality of program threads and is configured to de-schedule the program thread, to deallocate the program thread, and to reschedule the program thread to resume execution[.]" Applicant respectfully submits neither Mobini nor Dupree discloses at least these features of claim 84. Consequently, Applicant respectfully asserts independent claim 84 is patentable over Mobini and Dupree. Claim 85 depends from claim 84 and is therefore also patentable over Mobini and Dupree. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner

Amendment dated February 17, 2009 - 23 -
Reply to Office Action of October 16, 2008

Kevin D. KISSELL
Appl. No. 10/684,348

reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 84 and 85 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mobini and Dupree set forth at paragraph 8 of the Office Action.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed or accommodated. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



David C. Isaacson
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,500

Date: February 17, 2009

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

894189v1

Atty. Dkt. No. 1778.3310000 (0189.00US)